DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 549 IR 008 230

AUTHOR Burr, Julie; Willis, Don
TITLE Information for Community Action: A Demonstration of University/Public Library Cooperation in Meeting Community Groups' Informational Needs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Seattle Univ., Wash.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Office of Libraries and Learning Resources.
PUB DATE Sep 79
NOTE 103p.; Appendix H is minimally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Centers; *Community Information Services; *Community Involvement; *Community Programs; Community Resources; Directories; *Information Needs; *Library Services; Newsletters; Public Libraries

ABSTRACT

A project was undertaken jointly by the Seattle Public Library and Seattle University's Community Resource Center to establish a method of making pertinent information available to community group members. Activities of the Community Resource Center were to: (1) coordinate a computerized directory of community groups, (2) publish a newsletter, (3) edit five case studies of community activities, (4) answer information and referral requests, (5) form a community information advisory committee, and (6) design and implement the project evaluation. The Seattle Public Library pursued these activities: preparation for the establishment of a community resource system, establishment of neighborhood resource centers, training sessions for library staff, and project promotion. Activities of both project participant groups were evaluated through questionnaires given to branch library staffs, project staff, and key persons involved with the project. Use of neighborhood resource centers was evaluated through pre-project and follow-up questionnaires sent to leaders of community groups. Effectiveness of the program and plans for its second year complete the report, with information-gathering tools and samples of community publications appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184549

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report
CFDA #13.475
PR #475AH80060

"Information for Community Action: A Demonstration of University/ Public Library Cooperation in Meeting Community Groups' Informational Needs"

Authors: Julie Burr
Don Willis

Prinicipal Investigator: Dr. Linda C. Fitzpatrick

Institute of Public Service
Community Resource Center
Seattle University
Seattle, WA 98122

September, 1979

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources

IR008230

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

I. Problem Statement..... 1

II. Background

Seattle Public Library..... 3

Community Resource Center, Seattle University..... 3

III. Project Objectives and Activities

Community Resource Center Project Activities..... 5

Seattle Public Library Project Activities..... 9

IV. Analysis of Project Activities

Community Resource Center Project Activities..... 16

Seattle Public Library Project Activities..... 24

V. Pre-Project Questionnaire

Summary of Pre-Project Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups..... 29

Complete Results of Pre-Project Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups..... 31

VI. Follow-Up Questionnaire

Summary of Follow-Up Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups..... 40

Complete Results of Follow-Up Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups..... 42

VII. Library Staff Member Evaluation Questionnaire

Summary of the Library Staff Members' Project Evaluation Questionnaire..... 48

Complete Results of the Library Staff Members' Project Evaluation Questionnaire.....50

VIII. Project Staff Evaluation Questionnaire Results..... 55

IX. Project Evaluation by Others Closely Associated with the Project 61

X. Summary..... 63

I. Problem Statement

Seattle is a relatively new, large city with many discrete and unique neighborhoods. Like many other large cities, Seattle is facing the problems that urban and industrial growth have created such as traffic congestion, school financing, air, water and noise pollution, land use controversies, urban sprawl and neighborhood crime. There are approximately 200 active community groups in the area whose members are working on solutions to these problems as well as working to improve or maintain the quality of life in their particular neighborhood. Many of these community leaders hope that the relative youth of Seattle compared to cities on the east coast, the relatively early awareness of potential urban problems and the active and informed involvement of these citizens organized for community action will aid in the effectiveness of these solutions.

However, groups that are actively involved in improving or maintaining the quality of life in their cities and residential neighborhoods, commonly called community or neighborhood councils or clubs, have traditionally existed in isolation from one another. Consequently, much of the local governmental expertise and experience acquired by one group is unknown to another group which may be working on a related problem. Staffed by voluntary, concerned citizens of the neighborhood, a community group frequently lacks the time, knowledge, expertise and contacts necessary to secure and analyze adequate information which would enable them to effectively deal with the problem or concerns which are the basis for their formation. There is no centralized

source of information to which they can turn for assistance, and city departments which are located downtown and operate only during the 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. "work hours", are inaccessible to many community leaders.

Staff from the Community Resource Center at Seattle University and the Seattle Public Library proposed to cooperatively establish a system of providing information, referral and technical assistance to community groups. Those proposing the project felt that a cooperative effort between the Public Library, traditionally specializing in providing information and materials to the public, and the University, traditionally engaged in education and research, could lend maximum benefit toward establishment of an effective system for community leaders to obtain current, useful information to aid them in their activities.

II. Background - Seattle Public Library

The Seattle Public Library, consisting of a central library, 22 branch libraries, Mobile Outreach and the Governmental Research Assistance Library (a department of the Central Library located at City Hall), serves the City of Seattle, a city with a population of approximately a half million. Many non-Seattle residents who live within the greater King County area, an area with a population of approximately 1.25 million, also use the Seattle Public Library system. The Seattle Public Library, prior to the project proposal, had been concerned about the informational needs of community leaders. The library had completed surveys and compiled relevant census data on various local communities, organized files containing information about community groups and established liaisons between designated branch librarians and various community groups. One regional librarian and one branch librarian had received training in community needs analysis and were acting as system resource personnel in the community studies area.

Background - Community Resource Center, Seattle University

The Institute of Public Service (an interdisciplinary center offering a Master of Public Administration degree) at Seattle University had been operating a Community Resource Center for approximately one and a half years. The information and referral function of the CRC was initiated by two graduate students who set up a filing system on active community groups in the area and compiled the information into a directory. Demand for information and referral services had caused the CRC to grow so that the CRC,

in addition to expanding its files to include information on approximately 200 community groups and updating the community council directory, began a community reference library, answered requests for advice, research and assistance, and began production of a monthly newsletter circulated to approximately 700 community leaders.

The Community Resource Center at Seattle University and the Seattle Public Library submitted a proposal to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare entitled, "Information for Community Action: A Demonstration of University/Public Library Cooperation in Meeting Community Groups' Information Needs." The Department funded the project under the Library Research and Demonstration Program, for one demonstration year, beginning in June of 1978.

III. Project Objectives and Activities

Seattle University Community Resource Center Project Activities

The approach to developing an information system to serve community groups involved a series of cooperative activities undertaken by the Seattle University Community Resource Center (CRC) and the Seattle Public Library. The Seattle University CRC coordinated the "Information for Community Action" project and began by hiring a full time "Community Information Specialist." The Community Information Specialist has a Master's degree in Public Administration with an emphasis in community planning and had previously been employed as the Librarian/Data Bank Coordinator at the CRC. The Community Information Specialist took responsibility for the following project activities:

1) Coordinated Computerization of the CRC's Information on Community Groups

The CRC had been maintaining current information on the Community councils/clubs in the area including officers' names, addresses and phone numbers, activities, boundaries, election month, meeting time and place, fundraising and newsletter information. However, because this information, summarized in the form of a directory, became outdated frequently, this activity became too costly and time consuming to pursue. During the project year, the Community Information Specialist hired a part time computer programmer to design a program for converting the information. Computerization of the directory facilitated updating and addition or deletion of information from the data base and allowed for selective printouts of

information (e.g. only those groups publishing their own newsletter.) In addition, the CRC mailing list was coded so that selective mailing lists (e.g. officers of groups outside the city, but within the county) could be obtained. Computerization of this information was done using the S.U. computer system. Access to this system was advantageous as project staff were able to obtain reduced rates for supplies and free computer time and storage. The staff sold computerized directories to individual organizations wanting the information for appropriate use for $15.00 which covered the cost of printing the directory, materials, postage and a cover for the directory. Mailing lists and labels were also sold at a rate of 3¢/label. (See appendix A for copy of a Directory page.)

2) Published the CRC Newsletter

The newsletter covered material on local and nationwide community issues and activities, and promoted the Seattle Public Library/Community Resource Center demonstration project. The newsletter also included bibliographies and abstracts of other relevant material to assist community groups in finding information they needed. (See appendix B for copy of a CRC newsletter.)

3) Edited Five Case Studies

Because many community activities are documented only through an ephemeral assortment of correspondence, meeting minutes, news clippings and grant proposals, the Community Information Specialist assembled materials for prototypical cases of community group activities so that other community groups faced by similar issues or pursuing similar activities in the future could refer to past experience in developing

their own strategies and activities. The five case studies completed for the project were:

a) "Fundraising For Neighborhood Groups; What Works in the Seattle Area"

b) "Community Group Bylaws: A Case Study of the Southwest Capitol Hill Neighborhood Council"

c) "The Montlake Community and the R. H. Thomson Expressway"

d) Southwest Capitol Hill--An Experiment in Community-University Cooperation

e) "Fundraising Strategies for Community Groups to Support Major Activities: A Case Study of Southeast Effective Development."

4) Answered Requests for Information and Referral

The Community Information Specialist continued to receive numerous requests for information and assistance from the public concerning community groups and neighborhood related activities and, with the computerized information file and the Community Information Librarian's assistance, was able to advise groups regarding appropriate sources of information. The Community Information Specialist has also answered inquiries and met with persons from across the nation to discuss the Community Resource Center and Community Information project.

5) Formed a Community Information Advisory Committee

The committee was comprised of representatives of community groups, staff of appropriate city departments and special interest groups and library staff representatives (see Appendix C for list of Advisory Committee members). The Community Information Specialist took responsibility for setting up meetings and agendas and for meeting minutes.

6) Designed and Implemented the Project Evaluation

The Community Information Specialist designed a system for monitoring and evaluating the Seattle Public Library/ Community Resource Center project.

The evaluation designed consisted of data to be collected on the use of project services and questionnaires to be sent to leaders of community groups, project staff and branch library staff. Data was collected on an ongoing basis by the Community Information Specialist regarding the number of clients that utilized particular information and referral services and products (newsletter, mailing lists and labels, directories) of the Community Resource Center and the extent of this utilization to determine the demand for such an information center and services for community leaders. The Seattle Public Library's Project Librarian monitored the number and types of materials circulated through the "Neighborhood Resource Centers" (see below) and the number of requests by telephone, mail or in person for information and materials related to community activities to help determine the utility of the Library's involvement in providing such services to community groups.

In addition, pre-project questionnaires were sent to 218 representaives of local community groups at the initiation of the project year. A post project questionnaire was sent to those who responded (81) to the initial questionnaire at the end of the project year to enable comparison of community leaders' informational gathering practices and to help determine whether establishment of the community information system made any difference in their information gathering

practices and was helpful in satisfying their informational needs. (See appendix D and E for samples of the pre and post project questionnaires.)

Additionally, a questionnaire was given to staff members of all branch libraries and to all project staff members to determine their attitudes and feelings about the project and its utility. (See appendix F,G and H for copies of these questionnaires.)

CRC Project Support Staff

Project funding enabled the CRC to hire a half time secretary who took telephone messages, ran errands, typed letters, reports and case studies for the Community Information Specialist and eventually took part in lay out and production of the CRC newsletter and updating of the computerized Community Group Directory data base.

The Institute of Public Service also sponsored a work-study student part time to telephone community group leaders and update the CRC's information on the current officers and activities of the community councils and clubs for the directory.

Seattle Public Library Project Activities

The Institute of Public Service contracted with the Seattle Public Library to hire a full time Community Information Librarian for the project to establish a method of making pertinent information available to community group members through the library system. The Librarian has a Master's degree in Librarianship and had demonstrated an interest in community activities through his previous involvement in his neighborhood

council. In developing a system for providing this information, he pursued the following activities:

1) Prepared for Establishment of Community Resource System

The Project Librarian met with designated liaisons for the three regions of the Seattle Public Library branch system and discussed the project, their roles and their suggestions for project activities. In addition, he met with the staff of each of the 22 branch libraries and Mobile Outreach to explain the project and solicit their ideas. Both the Project Librarian and the Community Information Specialist met with city officials and staff of community oriented groups to explain the project and determine methods of cooperation and information sharing for the benefit of the project.

2) Established "Neighborhood Resource Centers"

The Community Resource System took the form of "Neighborhood Resource Centers" to be established in all of Seattle's branch libraries. With input from the Advisory Committee, results of returned questionnaires, prior experience with materials in the Community Resource Center collection by CRC staff and a survey of the Seattle Public Library's current subscriptions, 13 periodicals were selected for inclusion in the resource collections for the project.

These periodicals were selected because of their potential pertinence to Seattle's community leaders:

CRC newsletter
Cascade - Journal of the Northwest
Center for Community Economic Development Newsletter
NORG (Neighborhood Organization Research Group) News Bulletin
Network Notes (from the National Self-Help Resource Center)
Interchange

Self Reliance
Rain
NAN Bulletin (National Association of Neighborhoods Bulletin)
Neighborhood Ideas
Small Town
Grantsmanship Center News
The Neighborhood Works

The editors of these publications were approached through a letter asking for free multiple subscriptions or multiple subscriptions at a reduced rate. Permission to photocopy relevant articles if needed was also requested, and in most cases granted. Response was favorable and project staff needed to commit only $579.00 for subscriptions that normally would cost approximately $1,375.00.

For subscriptions where no discount was available, only one or several subscriptions were ordered to be included in the resource collections for the larger neighborhood libraries.

During the second quarter of the project year, four "Neighborhood Resource Centers" were opened, one center in each quadrant of the city. Project staff had originally hoped to open centers in all of Seattle's 22 branch libraries at the same time for maximum publicity, but due to the slow rate of receipt of the materials ordered, only four centers were initially opened.

During the third quarter of the project year four more "full scale" NCR's were opened and fourteeen smaller NRC's in the remaining branch libraries.

The Neighborhood Resource Centers (NCR's) consisted of a free standing bookcase or a series of shelves, depending on

the availability of space in the particular neighborhood library. The collections were clearly designated with a "Neighborhood Resource Center" sign.

The core element of each NRC was the shelf-files, labeled on the spine with one of 8 different topics. The topics were chosen after analysing the responses to the questionnaire returned by officers in Seattle's many community councils. The eight topical headings in order of expressed interest, were as follows:

(1) Local Government--Seattle; (2) Land Use--Zoning; (3) The Neighborhood (a catchall of sorts including fund-raising information); (4) Transportation/Traffic; (5) Housing; (6) Conservation/Environment; (7) Crime Prevention; (8) Business/Economic Development.

Newspaper articles from community/weekly and daily papers which were thought to be of neighborhood interest were either clipped or photocopied, mounted on a piece of paper, and placed in chronological order (newest in front) in a three ring binder labeled "Local Newspaper Clipping File." Two other cut-away shelf-files were used for displaying (and were labeled) "Newsletters--Magazines of Neighborhood Interest." A catalog arranged by topic (one to two pages per topic) reflecting both the total holdings of the project and the location(s) of the individual titles was made available at each of the centers (see Appendix I for an example of a catalog page.) These catalogs were updated one time but project staff feel this activity is too time consuming and format changes will be necessary in the future.

To give a feeling for the type of material which is available in the centers, a short list of representative titles follows:

Goals for Seattle 2000
Citizen's Guide to Zoning (for Seattle)
Seattle City Council 1979-80 Work Program
Community Corporations and Neighborhood Control
Grass Roots Fundraising Book: How to Raise Money in Your Community
If You Want Air Time
An Urban Resource Inventory for Seattle
Landlord-Tenant Act (of Washington State)
Seattle People's Yellow Pages
Rainbook: Resource for Appropriate Technology
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA): How It Works in Seattle

These materials came from such diverse sources as Seattle city departments, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, League of Women Voters of Seattle, Urban Institute, Rand Corporation, University of Wisconsin Press, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, American Society of Planning Officials, Historic Seattle, Free Press, Center for Governmental Studies, Community Collaborators, University Associates, various agencies of the U.S. Government, Future Associates, Center for Community Change, YMCA Metrocenter (Seattle), National Association of Broadcasters, National Urban Coalition, Center for Community Economic Development, Community Ownership Organizing Project, Conservation Foundation, as well as more traditional book publishers.

To promote a sense of community and an identification with one's own neighborhood, a map of the area surrounding each NRC was created for the larger centers. A clear acetate sheet placed over the neighborhood map allowed the use of a grease pencil to temporarily highlight projects or developments in the community.

Widespread concern with land use planning and zoning issues prompted project staff to use maps from the city's zoning code. When revised map pages are added to the code manual, photo copies of the pages can be glued over the individual out-of-date map pages which are part of the composite neighborhood map. Notices of public hearings and agendas and meeting minutes were prominently displayed on archboards.

3) Held Training Sessions for Library Staff

The Project Librarian held training sessions with library staff to further acquaint them with the NRC Project, as it was referred to at Seattle Public Library, and materials in the Neighborhood Resource Center collections and to increase their awareness of the informational needs of leaders of community councils and clubs Project staff felt it extremely important that library staff be familiar with the materials in the NRC collections in order to be able to assist NRC patrons and insure maximum usage of the collections.

4) Promoted the Project

The opening of the first four centers was accompanied by a major publicity effort. The Project Librarian spoke to the community councils nearest to these first NRC's to make them aware of the centers and what type of information they could expect to find. Two local radio stations interviewed project staff and broadcast news of the opening of the four centers. One local television station covered the representative opening and a press conference was held. The project-produced monthly CRC newsletter highlighted the opening of the Centers and continued to keep readers informed of NRC developments. Project staff also

designed a brochure describing the project which was sent to everyone on the CRC mailing list.

IV. Analyses of Project Activities - Community Resource Center

1.) Computerized Community Group Directory

Computerization of the Community Group Directory greatly decreased the amount of clerical time needed to insure an up to date product and increased its value to individuals and organizations needing a current list of community groups, their leaders and activities. However, the huge task of regularly updating information on the community groups remained and the Institute of Public Service sponsored a part time work-study student solely for this purpose. More community leaders and city staff called the CRC on their own initiative to volunteer new information about community groups after the directory was computerized because of their increased confidence in the ability of project staff to keep a computerized directory current.

Computerization of the directory was completed during the second quarter of the project year and the first directory was sold for $15.00 in January of 1979. From January through July of 1979 (7 months) the Community Information Specialist's records indicate that 59 directories were sold for $15.00 each. The breakdown of those purchasing the directory is as follows:

Purchasers	Number Sold	Percentage of Total Sales
Staff of City Departments (including staff persons from the City's Engineering Dept., Office of the Neighborhood Planning, Law and Justice Planning Office, Seattle City Council, Seattle Building Dept., Seattle Parks and Recreation Department)	14	22

Purchasers	Number Sold	Percentage of Total Sales
Community Oriented Groups (such as groups concerned with water pollution, energy conservation, etc.)	10	16
Members of Local Community Councils and Clubs	9	14
Staff of Private Institutions (such as lending institutions, arts groups, businesses)	9	14
Staff of County Departments (including staff from the County's Parks and Recreation Department, the County Executive's Office, the Policy Development Commission, and King County Council)	4	6
Private Citizens	4	6
Media (including both of Seattle's major newspapers and one major T.V. station)	4	6
Elected Officials/Political Campaign Purposes	5	8

The number of requests for directories indicates the utility of such an up-to-date listing of community leaders and groups for staff of city and county departments who use the directory to increase citizen participation in their governmental decision making processes. Members of special interest groups are using the directory to alert neighborhood leaders to issues which may be important to them and members of community councils/clubs use the directory for networking and to learn from each other's experiences. Although the number of computerized community group directories sold illustrates a demand for such a service, it must be assumed that each directory sold is being shared with fellow staff members, thus multiplying the number of directory users. Users have also indicated a willingness

to pay an increased price if updates were sent out regularly.

In addition to the directories sold for $15 each, 10 more directories were sold at a reduced rate or without charge because they were unable to pay the full $15.00.

A copy of the computerized community group directory was also eventually included, towards the end of the project year, in each Neighborhood Resource Center collection. Towards the end of the project year project staff began using 4 - ply carbon paper which made it possible to produce four directories at once and fill orders for the directory more efficiently.

Other Computerized Products

In addition to requests for community group directories, the Community Information Specialist received twelve requests for computerized community group lists and labels from January 1979 through July 1979. Some persons/ organizations requesting the list or labels indicated that they planned to use it as a Master, xeroxing their own labels off of it, indicating a larger use of the computerized mailing lists and labels than the 12 sold implies.

Distribution of the CRC newsletter was much more efficient with the use of computerized mailing labels sorted out by zip code as required by the post office for bulk mailings.

Several requests for specialized information, such as groups publishing their own newsletter, have also been received and satisfied.

The biggest advantage to operating the computer component of the project out of the Seattle University computer

system has been the reduced costs granted to project staff for project related activities. The disadvantages have been that because of the large work orders from project staff, computer center personnel have often given project orders a low priority, causing a longer turn around time than for other orders from other Seattle University departments.

The Community Information Specialist has set up a separate account for the project with the intention of using the money received from sale of the computerized products, after reimbursing Seattle University for supplies, into development and expansion of the program. CRC staff hope eventually to make the computerized community group information services a self-sustaining operation or make arrangements for another organization to incorporate this service as a part of their regular activities.

2) Community Resource Center Newsletter

At the beginning of the project year the CRC mailing list included approximately 400 names of officers of community groups in King County and an additional 300 names of individuals requesting to be included on the mailing list to receive the CRC newletter and other mailings. During the project year the Community Information Specialist received 71 additional requests to be included on the CRC mailing list. These requests were from individuals representing:

community organizations - 22
individual interest - 15
city/county departments - 13
private, nonprofit organizations - 6
community oriented groups - 6
businesses - 4

public institutions (educational institutions, special libraries etc.) - 3
political interests - 2

The Community Information Specialist has also received requests to be included on the CRC mailing list from persons pursuing similar activities in different parts of the state and nation including persons from:

Bremerton, Tacoma, Pullman and Yakima, Washington
Portland, Oregon (Portland Community Resource Center)
Washington, D.C. (National Association of Neighborhoods, National Self Help Resource Center, National Center for Appropriate Technology)
Anchorage, Alaska (Federation of Community Councils)
Jacksonville, Florida (Jacksonville Neighborhood Resource Center)
Tulsa, Oklahoma (Tulsa City-County Library, Citizens Information Service)
Cincinnati, Ohio (University of Cincinnati, Neighborhood Grantsmansip Center)
Ann Arbor, Michigan (University of Michigan)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Milwaukee Community Resource Network)

The Community Information Specialist is continuously receiving articles from special interest groups, community group members, and city and county staff members for inclusion in the CRC newsletter. Almost all articles are announcements of meetings and other opportunities for citizens to participate in a decision making process that may affect them. Timely, appropriate announcements, as well as bibliographies, articles about neighborhood activities locally and nationwide and information about the development of the Neighborhood Resource Centers are included in the newsletter. The number of requests for inclusion on the CRC mailing list, the persons requests are coming from, and the type of articles submitted for inclusion indicate that the CRC newsletter is serving this purpose as a networking tool to increase citizen participation and access to information to

increase their effectiveness in their activities.

The CRC newsletter is also being sent to each Neighborhood Resource Center to be posted on a designated clipboard.

3) Case Studies

As specified in the project proposal, the Community Information Specialist was to complete five case studies of prototypical community group activities to demonstrate how community groups could learn from each other's experiences if they were documented. The problem with this activity from the beginning was the large amount of time necessary to do a thorough case study. A scaling down of the original idea was needed while still making available five case studies. Consequently, the Community Information Specialist completed three case studies and edited two others that were completed by other IPS staff that were appropriate to the Community Information project objectives.

The first case study completed, "Community Group Fundraising: What Works in Seattle" was well received. The Project Librarian stated that it was circulating from the NRC collections. In addition, the Community Information Specialist received 12 requests to purchase their own copy of the fundraising case study from local community group members, one request from a community group leader in Indiana, and a request from the Civic Action Institute in Washington, D.C. to include an abstract about the case study in their newsletter "Neighborhood Ideas." This response demonstrates an interest in learning from the experiences of community groups, at least in the fundraising area. The remaining four case studies were only recently

published and distributed to the Neighborhood Resource Centers and there is no data available on their use at this time.

4) Information and Referral Services

The Community Information Specialist documented 137 requests for information and referral related to community groups and neighborhood activities during the time between 8/1/78 and 8/1/79. Typical requests are:

-What is the address, telephone number of a certain community group/s?
-Which community groups represent the area in which I live?
-Which groups operate tools/skills exchanges?

The community Information Specialist also documented 42 requests for information about the establishment and operation of the Community Resource Center and the Neighborhood Resource Center project. Requests came from: Seattle, Washington (24), Wenatchee, Washington (2), Tacoma, Washington (1), Washington, D.C. (5), Oregon (3), Ohio (2), Michigan (1), New York (1), Florida (1), Colorado (1), and Arizona (1). Persons requesting this type of information were interested in setting up a community information system themselves, wanted to know what services were offered or were already operating a community information center and wanted to learn through other's experience. Sharing of this type of information is truly in accordance with the goals of a demonstration project that could be replicated by other organizations and the large number of requests for such information during the first project year indicates the interest in establishing community information systems from persons across the nation.

5) Technical Assistance

Previous to the project year, the CRC was in a position to offer technical assistance as one of its services to community groups through employment of several CETA employees. During the course of the project year the Community Information Specialist continued to receive requests (80) for technical assistance but did not have the help of the CETA employees in answering these requests. The breakdown of requests for technical assistance is as follows:

5 requests for assistance in drafting/revising bylaws

1 request for boardsmanship training

29 requests for fundraising/grant-writing assistance

2 requests for assistance with incorporation procedures

2 requests for information regarding annexation of an area to another city

7 requests for interns to do research, analyses, organizing, etc. in the community

32 miscellaneous requests such as for room reservations for meetings, assistance in planning a conference, writing a press release, putting together a newsletter, etc.

The Community Information Specialist attempted to answer as many of these requests for technical assistance as possible, but after termination of CETA staff, requests for extensive technical assistance such as grant-writing were unable to be filled. Other requests requiring less time, approximately 80% of all requests, were satisfied. Time taken to fill these requests added to the discrepancies between the project time line and the actual completion of project activities. Completion of the case studies on bylaws and fundraising will, in

the future, be used to answer requests for technical assistance in these areas. Other persons requesting technical assistance can be referred to materials in the Neighborhood Resource Centers. However, there will always be miscellaneous requests which require a staff person's time if they are to be satisfied.

6) Requests for Written Resource Materials

The Community Information Specialist, during the course of the project year, received 19 requests for written resource materials to aid leaders in their activities. Requests were for:

8 requests for materials on community economic development

2 requests for materials on how to work with the media

6 miscellaneous requests

3 requests for materials on community organizing.

The Community Information Specialist referred persons making these requests to the Neighborhood Resource Centers and/or the Community Information Librarian. All requests were filled satisfactorily.

Seattle Public Library

1) Telephone Log Summary

During the project year the project librarian and his clerical assistant contacted by telephone 168 members of community groups and 62 city employees to inform them of project activities or discuss project related concerns. In addition, he received reference questions by telephone from 36 members of community groups and city personnel regarding neighborhood resource materials and the Neighborhood Resource Centers themselves.

A good deal of the project librarian's time spent implementing project activities was by telephone and a summary of telephone calls during the project year is as follows:

296 telephone calls to and from Seattle Public Library staff members

147 telephone calls regarding materials acquisition

74 telephone calls to CRC project staff members

22 reference telephone calls received from CRC and Seattle Public Library staff

18 telephone calls to advisory committee members

7 telephone calls to the Research and Demonstration Program Office in Washington, D.C.

Use of Neighborhood Resource Centers

During the middle of the fourth quarter of the project year the Project Librarian visited nine Neighborhood Resource Centers for the purpose of observing actual use of the centers first-hand. Six of the eight full-scale centers in the branches were visited along with three out of fourteen of the small centers.

One generalization which can be made from the on-site visits is that all of the centers were underutilized at the time of observation. The small centers have relatively few items available to attract interest (approximately 30 titles, including newsletters) beyond the posted notices of public hearings. The full-scale centers have a greater draw due to the 'neighborhood map' displayed and the larger quantity of materials offered. However, most of the observed usage consisted of a brief examination of notices and materials.

Of 145 adults observed in the branch libraries, 20% (29)

used the centers. Out of the 29 individuals observed using the centers, 24 (82.7%) spent one minute or less at a center. The three centers which received the highest level of use are located within fifteen feet of the main entrance in one case (Henry Branch) or directly by the path to the main part of the branch collection (Lake City, Queen Anne), indicating the importance of highly visible placement of the centers.

Circulation of NRC materials from the full-scale centers at the branches was determined by counting 1) the hand-charged NRC Project book cards in the circulation file at each branch, 2) the number of names or S.P.L. card numbers on each book card if the book card was available, and 3) the number of missing items (used here as a measure of interest) revealed during an inventory of materials at the full-scale centers. Dividing the resultant figure of 155 by the total number of different titles of 336 (a newsletter or magazine subscription is counted as one and not the total number of issues available) acquired by the project yields a .46 circulation per item rate. A number of the items available in the NRC collections could be read or skimmed in the library. However, this type of use is not reflected in the circulation statistics.

An interesting comparison can be made between the circulation of materials in the full-scale NRC collections and the rest of the nonproject book collections available at the same eight branches. The only currently available figures for the size of the branch collections are the number of cataloged items. The comparison then between the combined cataloged print collection at the eight branches (190,559) and the

circulation figures during the same time span (125,746) results in a .66 figure. (The most recent branch library circulation figures available were for the first quarter of 1979. At the time of the circulation check, the full-scale centers had been established an average of 4 1/2 months. Consequently, the quarterly branch circulation figure was projected to cover the same 4 1/2 month time span. Also, the branch collection size used does not reflect noncataloged items, such as paperback books. If this figure in the denominator included noncataloged items, the .66 figure would be lower.)

None of the material in the centers is reflected in the branch card catalog. Perhaps this lessens the visibility, and therefore use, of NRC materials. The time involved in having the material cataloged was the chief reason for using minimal processing.

Advisory Committee

Members of eleven community/nonprofit groups, five library representatives and two staff members of appropriate city departments were selected to sit on the Community Information Advisory Committee for the project. The Committee met five times during the project year to discuss major project direction and activity decisions. Some areas where Advisory Committee input was extremely valuable were:

1) the topics for the five case studies
2) which information was to be included in the computerized community group directory

3) which resources would be most valuable to be included in the computerized community group directory

4) ideas for project development and expansion during a second project year

In addition to discussing project activities outlined in the project proposal, Advisory Committee members contributed unique and valuable ideas for activities to increase the effectiveness of the project. One idea was to hold training sessions with library staff to sensitize them to the informational needs of community groups and insure their awareness of the materials in the NRC collections.

Participation of Advisory Committee Members representing the community groups, the city and the library system was particularly valuable. The vaious connections and insights each member possessed served to tie the project together and also helped to anticipate potential obstacles. The Committee also promoted the project through word of mouth publicity.

However, as the year progressed, attendance at meetings fell, expecially on the part of community group members so that those attending regularly were largely library representatives and staff of the city departments. Perhaps this was because attendance on the part of library and city department staff was job related whereas attendance on the part of the community leaders was totally voluntary.

Project staff will make it a priority to insure increased community group representation on project committees during the next project year.

V. Summary of Pre-Project Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups

Land use and zoning (cited 47 times), transportation/traffic (cited 31 times), parks and recreation (23 times), housing (20 times) and street improvements (19 times) were the most commonly mentioned issues of concern to the community leaders responding to the pre-project questionnaire.

Community leaders turned most often to members of city departments and city publications for assistance while pursuing these concerns (cited 69 times) and often to local resource persons and experienced community council leaders (24 times) for assistance and advice.

Fifty-one of the eighty one respondents (63%) used their neighborhood library, but of those using neighborhood libraries, only 15 (18%) used them for materials to help them in their neighborhood activities.

Most of those who did not use their neighborhood library for neighborhood improvement related activities either did not feel they were good resources for relevant materials (18 replies) or did not perceive a need to use neighborhood libraries for neighborhood activities (14 replies).

Of the 81 questionnaire respondents, 55 (68%) use the Central Library, but only 18 (22%) stated they used the Central Library for neighborhood improvement resources. Many (14 replies) stated they did not see it as a good resource for such material or that it was not easily accessible (11 replies) because of location and parking.

Twenty-two of the 81 respondents (27%) used the Governmental

Research Assistance Library (formerly called the Municipal Reference Library) and of these 14 (17%) used this library for neighborhood improvement related activities. Many stated they didn't use this library because they didn't know of its existance (16 replies) or didn't perceive a need to use it for neighborhood related activities (8 replies).

The most frequent suggestions for materials to be included in the Neighborhood Resource Centers were for materials on land use and zoning, city policies, structure and services, information about community group activities locally and nationwide and housing materials.

Complete Results of Pre-Project Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups

Questionnaires were sent to 218 members of local community councils and clubs on August 14, 1978, with stamped, return envelopes to increase the response rate. Community leaders were asked to complete and return the questionnaires; by August 31, 55 questionnaires had been returned (25%). One hundred community leaders were then telephoned and "reminded" to complete and return the questionnaire. A final total of 81 questionnaires were completed and returned (37%). (See appendix D for copy of the questionnaire).

#1a) Are you a member of a neighborhood improvement group (e.g. community council or club?)

All responses were from leaders of community groups.

#1b) If yes, what is the name of the group to which you belong?

Northeast Seattle - 17 responses from persons representing 10 different community groups

Northwest Seattle - 19 responses from persons representing 10 different community groups

Central Seattle - 16 responses from persons representing 10 different community groups

Southeast Seattle - 18 responses from persons representing 9 different community groups

Southwest Seattle - 10 responses from persons representing 5 different community groups

#2) What are the major issues your neighborhood improvement group was actively involved with during the past year? Some respondents named only one or two issues while others

listed five or six. Responses are as follows:

land use/zoning concerns	47
transportation/traffic concerns	31
parks/recreation	23
housing issues	20
street improvements (trees, paving alleys, etc.)	19
social service provision (senior citizens, etc.)	12
environmental concerns (air pollution, etc.)	11
crime control	9
fundraising through grants and neighborhood projects	7
site location (location of halfway houses, etc.)	6
employment opportunities, economic development	6
education, school concerns	5
historical preservation	5
community studies and needs assessments	4
animal control	2
energy conservation	2
taxes	2
consumer affairs	1

#3) What informational resources did you use to help you in your neighborhood activities?

Again, some persons gave one or two responses while others gave four or five. Responses were as follows:

members of city departments and city publications	69
local resource persons and experienced community group leaders	24
various libraries	13

non-profit special interest groups	9
Community Resource Center	6
Environmental Impact Statements	5
News media (radio, T.V., newspapers)	5
Universities	3

#4) What informational resources did you find most useful? Why?

members of city departments and city publications	46
local resource persons and experienced community group leaders	16
libraries	6
non-profit/special interest groups	5
Community Resource Center	4
Environmental Impact Statements	3
News media	2

Many respondents did not explain why they felt certain informational resources they turned to were most useful to them in their activities. Of those who did, the usual explanation was that city staff members and publications were most useful for current, timely information that was needed in "crisis" situations.

#5) How did you find out about these informational resources?

referred by experienced community group members and local resource persons	36
referred by members of city departments	15
found resource through telephone book	8
received notice of resource through mail	6
through the news media	3
referred by members of special interest groups	2
library	1

#6) What information was difficult to find or unavailable that you would have found useful in your neighborhood activities? Many did not respond to this question. Of those who did, the response is as follows:

straight, unbiased answers from staff of city departments	13
neighborhood census/statistical data	8
information on land use/zoning	5
information on funding sources	2
incorporation records	2
appropriate resource persons	1
state/federal documents	1
historical information for research	1
technical information	1

#7) What is the name of your neighborhood library and which neighborhood library do you use most often?
All 81 respondents knew the name and were familiar with the library in their neighborhood. Fifty-one respondents used the branch library in their own neighborhood, 16 respondents did not use any neighborhood library.

#7c) How often do you use this library?

8	once or more/week	16	3-4 times/year
14	2 times/month	8	rarely
8	once/month	16	never

#7d) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

15	yes	48	no

#7e) If yes, what type of activities were you involved in and what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities?

The response by those who have used their branch library for neighborhood activities was as follows:

land use/zoning	3	community studies	1
grant/fundraising information	2	use of law books	1
		maps	1
Environmental Impact Statements	2	information on parks	1
housing rehabilitation information	2	"research"	1
		census information	1
city policies/budgets	2		
economic development materials	2		

#7f) If no, why haven't you used this library to obtain information to help you with your neighborhood activities?

did not feel it was a good resource, insufficient materials related to neighborhood activities	18
did not have a need to use the library for neigh- neighborhood activities	14
information from city departments and other agencies was sufficient	5
need more current information than was available at the library	3
inconvenient hours, takes too much time to do research	4
use University library	1

#8a) Do you use the main Seattle Public Library located downtown?

55 yes 18 no 8 no response

#8b) If yes, how often do you use this library?

6	once or more/week	20	3-4 times/year
9	2 times/month	19	rarely
4	once/month		

#c) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

18	yes	50	no
		5	no response

#8d) If yes, what type of activities were you involved in and what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities?

Very few responded to the first part of the question, 'what type of activities were you involved in', perhaps because they felt it was a repeat of question #1. Of those responding to 'what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities', the answers were as follows:

information regarding city policies/budgets	4
grant/fundraising information	2
use of Law books	1
historical research materials	1
newsclipping files	1
"research"	1
neighborhood data	1
resource information	1
employment/economic development materials	3

#8e) If no, why haven't you used this library to obtain information to help you with your neighborhood activities?

didn't see it as a good resource for neighborhood activities (not enough relevant material, etc.)	14
library is not accessible (location, parking, etc.)	11
no perceived need to use the library for neighborhood-related activites	9
neighborhood library served needs	1
can't take reference material home	1
city departments are a better resource	1

#9a) Do you use the Municipal Reference Library of the Seattle Public Library system (now called the Governmental Research Assistance Library)?

22 yes 44 no

15 no response

#9b) If yes, how often do you use this library?

2	once or more/week	5	3-4 times/year
4	2 times/month	8	rarely
3	once/month		

#9c) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

14 yes 29 no

38 no response

#9d) If yes, what type of activities were you involved in and what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities?

Again, people did not respond to the first part of the question but the 14 persons who did use the Municipal Reference Library for neighborhood activities responded to the second part of the question with the following information:

land use/zoning codes	5
materials about other community groups	3
historical research	1
environmental impact statements	1
agency resources	1
law books	1
community studies	1
housing information	1
"research"	1

#9e) If no, why haven't you used this library to obtain information to help you with your neighborhood activities?

didn't know there was such a library	16
no need to use this library for neighborhood activities	8
not sure what materials are in the collection	5
didn't see it as a good resource for neighborhood activities (not enough relevant information, etc.)	4
not accessible (parking, location)	2
city department have adequate information	1

#10) What inforamtion related to neighborhood improvement would you like to see included in neighborhood resource centers in your neighborhood library, main library and Municipal Reference Library?

Almost all who responded to this question did not break their answers into which materials should go into the separate library collections, but responded with one answer, as follows:

zoning/land use materials (information about permits, maps, comprehensive land use plan, property owner information)	21
city policies, budgets, structure, council agendas, etc.	14
information about community groups locally and nationwide	11
housing information including housing rehab "how-to" manuals	8
Washington State law books/regulations	7
census, neighborhood data	4
fundraising/grant information	4
Environmental Impact Statements	4
resource directories	3
materials on community organizing strategies	2
Community Resource Center newsletter	1
Congressional activities that pertain to neighborhoods	1

VI. Summary of the Follow-Up Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups

Land use and zoning (14 replies), transportation and traffic (9 replies), housing (7 replies) and parks and recreation (4 replies) remained the major concerns of questionnaire respondents at the end of the project year.

Community leaders continued to turn most often to staff of city departments and city publications while pursuing those concerns (16 replies) and to experienced community group leaders and local resource people (7 replies) for assistance and advice.

Fifteen of the 23 questionnaire respondents (65%) used their neighborhood libraries. Ten questionnaire respondents were familiar with the Neighborhood Resource Centers in their branch libraries (43%) but only 4 (17%) had actually used materials from the NRC collections. Although these figures indicate a low usage of the NRC's, questionnaire responses were not received from representatives of the Queen Anne, Wallingford, Lake City, West Seattle, and Greenlake neighborhoods - areas where full-scale NRC's have been established.

Fifteen of the 23 respondents (65%) used the Central Library of the Seattle Public Library system and of these, 5 used the Central Library for resources to aid them in their neighborhood activities (22%).

Three questionnaire respondents (13%) used the Governmental Research Assistance Library and two of these (9%) used the G.R.A. Library for neighborhood activities.

Only a few questionnaire respondents gave suggestions for materials to improve the NRC collections, mentioning materials on fundraising

and economic development.

Complete Results of the Follow-Up Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups

A follow-up questionnaire was sent at the end of the project year to all 81 community leaders who responded to the pre-project questionnaire. (See appendix E for sample of follow-up questionnaire.) Twnety three questionnaires were returned, a 28% response rate. Results of the questionnaire are as follows:

#1a - c) What is the name of your neighborhood? Are you a member of a neighborhood improvement group? What is the name of the group?

Northeast Seattle - 3 responses from persons representing three different community groups.

Northwest Seattle - 8 responses from persons representing six different community groups.

Central Seattle - 5 responses from persons representing five different community groups.

Southeast Seattle - 6 responses from persons representing four different community groups.

Southwest Seattle - 1 response

#2) What are the major issues your neighborhood improvement group was actively involved with during the past year? Some respondents gave one or two answers and some gave several. The response was as follows:

Land use/zoning	14	Historical preservation	3
Transportation/traffic	9	Economic development	2
Housing	7	Neighborhood arts	2
Parks/recreation	4	Site location	2
Energy conservation	3	Consumer affairs	2

Grants/fundraising	2	Environment	1
Education/schools	2		

#3) What informational resources did you use to help you in your activities? Again, some gave several answers, some gave one or two, and five persons did not respond.

Staff of city departments/ city publications	16	Members of special interest/ non-profit groups	4
Experienced community group members, local resource people	7	Community Resource Center	3
News media (newspaper, T.V., radio)	5	Other libraries	2
		Neighborhood Resource Centers	1

#4) What informational resources did you find most useful and why? Some gave more than one answer, many (15) did not respond to this question.

Staff of city departments/ city documents	6	Community Resource Center	1
Experienced community group members, local resource people	5	Members of special interest/ non-profit groups	1

#5) How did you find out about these informational resources? Some gave more than one answer, eight did not respond.

Experienced community group members, neighborhood resource persons	10	Members of non-profit/ special interest groups	1
Members of city depts.	4	Telephone book	1
News media	2		

#6) What information was difficult to access or unavailable that you would have found useful in your neighborhood activities?

Straight, unbiased answers from members of city depts.	2	Information on city policies, budget, etc.	1

Technical information	2	Community organizing strategies	1
Economic development materials	1	No response	16

#7a & b) What is the name of your branch library? Do you use this library? 15 respondents used the branch library in their own neighborhood, 3 did not and 5 did not respond.

Those using their neighborhood library reported the following frequency of use:

once or more/week	1	3-4 times/year	5
2 times/month	3	rarely	1
once/month	5		

#7c) Do you use another branch library in addition to, or instead of, the one nearest your residence?

5 respondents did use another branch library rather than the one nearest their residence, 13 did not, and 5 did not respond. Those using a different branch library did so because the collections were more complete or the library was more convenient to them during work hours.

#8a) Are you familiar with your Neighborhood Resource Center which is now a part of your branch library?

yes	10
no	12
no response	1

#8b) If yes, how did you hear about the Neighborhood Resource Center:

CRC/Neighborhood Resource Center publicity	6
Community council/club member	3
No response	14

#8c) Have you browsed through or actually used materials from the Neighborhood Resource Center collection?

yes	10
no	12
no response	1

#8d) What materials in the collection interested you and/or contributed to your effectiveness as a neighborhood improvement group leader?

Grantwriting/fundraising materials	2
Economic development materials	1
Housing materials	1
No response	19

#8e) What materials were not included in the Neighborhood Resource Center collections that you would find useful as a neighborhood leader?

More information from city departments	1
More materials on community economic development	1
No response	21

#8f) Do you have any comments about the Neighborhood Resource Centers?

NRC's are a good idea/hope staff continue to develop them	4
No response	19

#9a) Do you use the main Seattle Public Library located downtown?

yes	15
no	8

#9b) If yes, how often do you use this library?

once or more/week	2	3-4 times/year	3
2 times/month	1	rarely	6
once/month	2	no response	9

#9c) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

yes	5
no	13
no response	5

#9d) If yes, what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities? Respondents who had used the library for neighborhood activities (5), gave the following answers (some gave more than 1 answer):

Reference materials	2
Resident/home owner information	2
Resource directories	2
Land use materials	1
Economic development materials	1
Community organizing materials	1
No response	18

#10a) Do you use the Governmental Research Assistance Library (formerly called the Municipal Reference Library) of the Seattle Public Library system?

yes	3
no	18
no response	2

#10b) If yes, how often do you use this library?

once or more/week		3-4 times yearly	2
two times/month		rarely	1
once/month		no response	20

#10c) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

yes	2
no	7
no response	14

#10d) If yes, what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities? (one respondent listed 2 types of information.)

fundraising	1
economic development	2
no response	20

VII. Summary of the Library Staff Members' Project Evaluation Questionnaires

Thirty five of the fifty four library staff who completed the evaluation questionnaire (65%) felt that resource centers for community groups logically belong in the library system and two others responded more specifically that they belong in the library system, but not in every branch. Eleven (20%) felt that such resource centers would be more appropriately located elsewhere and six (11%) did not respond to this question.

Forty five library staff members who completed the questionnaire (83%) stated that the establishment of NRC's in Seattle's branch libraries had little or no effect on their role as a library staff member while eight (15%) felt that their role was affected due to establishment of these centers.

Twenty-six staff members (48%) believed a need existed for special training in order for staff to adequately serve the informational needs of community groups, 20 (37%) felt there was no need for such training and 8 gave no response to this question (15%). Thirty six of the respondents (67%) felt the training given them during the project year was helpful; however, many indicated a need for additional, more specific training.

Thirty four (63%) of the library staff respondents were favorably impressed with the physical set up of the NRC's, 4 (7%) felt they could be improved, and 3 (6%) felt that separate NRC collections crowded the already overcrowded branches. Twenty one (39%) felt the materials in the NRC collections were useful, 19 (35%) had no comments on the materials and others felt the low use of the materials demonstrated limited interest in them

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Copy of a page from the computerized Community Group Directory

Appendix B: Copy of a Community Resource Center Newsletter

Appendix C: Community Information Project Advisory Committee Members

Appendix D: Pre-project questionnaire sent to leaders of community groups

Appendix E: Follow-up project evaluation questionnaire sent to leaders of community groups

Appendix F: Project evaluation questionnaire given to branch library staff

Appendix G: Project evaluation questionnaire given to project staff

Appendix H: Project evaluation questionnaire given to other key persons involved with the project

Appendix I: Copy of a Neighborhood Resource Center Catalogue page

or that information in the centers duplicated existing information and so was not being used.

Eighteen (33%) felt the existing circulation system set up by project staff for NRC materials was adequate while 16 (30%) felt it should conform to the library's regular loan circulation period. Others had no response or didn't feel qualified to respond.

The majority of respondents (33, or 61%) felt the materials were being underutilized and needed more publicity to increase use, 7 felt use was increasing (13%) and 10 (19%) had no response.

Twenty-two (41%) had favorable impressions of project staff, 23 (43%) did not respond to the question about project staff and 9 (13%) had "lukewarm" impressions of project staff.

In response to questions about resources generated from the CRC (computerized community council/club directory, community group map, CRC newsletter, case studies), many library staff members indicated they were unaware of some or all of these resources. Those who were aware of them had either become familiar with them while browsing through the NRC collections, upon inquiry of a patron, or during project training sessions.

Frequent suggestions for improvement of the NRC's were for more publicty and community outreach, more involvement of branch staff for publicity efforts and more staff training.

Complete Results of the Library Staff Members' Project Evaluation Questionnaires

Project staff sent "Neighborhood Resource Center" project evaluation questionnaires to 57 library staff members in order to obtain feedback from the library staff members' point of view on the utility of the project and present their views in the evaluation report. The response rate was 94.7%. Responses are listed below. (See appendix F for a copy of the questionnaire).

1. In which library or libraries do you generally work?

The questionnaire was sent to 57 library staff members who were responsible between themselves for the operation of the 22 branch libraries in the Seattle Public Library System. Out of 20 sent to individuals in the South Region (9 branches), 17 were returned. Out of 16 sent out in the Northeast Region (6 branches), all 16 were returned. And in the Northwest Region (7 branches), 22 were sent out and 21 were returned. The overall response rate (57 sent out, 54 returned) was 94.7%.

2. Do you think Resource Centers for Community Council/Club members belong in the library system or in some other agency?

35 appropriate in libraries, logical spot for this type of information
11 more appropriate located elsewhere, not appropriate
6 no opinion, no response
2 yes, but not in every branch

3. Has the establishment of Neihgborhood Resource Centers in Seattle's branch libraries affected your role as a library staff member?

35 no
10 very little
8 yes
1 no response

4. If so, how do you feel about this change?

40 no response
7 positive
7 miscellaneous comments

5. Do you think library staff need special training to adequately serve the informational needs of Community Council/Club members? If so, what kind of training?

26 yes
20 no
8 don't know, no response

6. Has training given by project staff been helpful in answering questions about the Neighborhood Resource Centers during the past year? Explain.

19 helpful, but too general, not enough training, etc.
17 helpful
11 no response
7 missed training sessions

7. What is your impression of the following aspects of the Neighborhood Resource Centers in Seattle's branch libraries:

<u>physical set-up</u>

25 good, attractive, visible, convenient, etc.
12 no response, don't feel qualified to respond
6 adequate, functional
4 could be improved
3 crowds already crowded branches, low use doesn't warrant space
3 archboards are useful
1 other

<u>materials in the NRC collections</u>

21 good, useful, adequate, certain items useful
19 no comment, no opinion
8 low use, of limited interest
3 duplicates existing information
2 confusing, too much to plough through
1 not all are full scale centers, discriminates against some branches

system for circulating NRC materials

18 good, adequate
16 should conform with regular circulation loan period, needs refining, system cumbersome
13 no response, not qualified to answer
6 no complaints, have never used
1 staff needs more training

use of NRC's

33 low use/no use, need more publicity
10 no opinion, no response
7 good/improving
4 fair

NRC project staff

23 no response, noncommittal
22 positive impressions (good, friendly, enthusiastic, helpful)
7 lukewarm impressions
2 other

8. Are you aware of the following components of the NRC project being coordinated at the Community Resource Center (CRC), Seattle University:

					No response
Community Council/Club directory	22	yes	no	24	8
Community Council/Club map	19	yes	no	27	8
CRC Newsletter	20	yes	no	24	10
Case studies	8	yes	no	34	12
CRC I & R services	9	yes	no	35	10

Please describe how you know about or how you have used any of the above mentioned components of the NRC project:

Directory

29 no response
9 examined files myself
7 never used, no comment
4 mentioned in training session
2 patron request
1 CRC newsletter
1 word of mouth
1 other

Map

(Note: There was some confusion in a few of the responses to this question in that the 'Community Council Map' available in all of the centers--folded--was being confused with the zoning map of the surrounding neighborhood constructed and posted at just the major centers (8).)

41 no response
4 observing patron use, used with patrons
3 never used, not used extensively
3 staff training
2 looked through files myself
1 CRC newsletter

Newsletter

41 no response
4 glanced at for own information
4 not used extensively, low use
3 checked them in, posted at branch
2 staff training

Case Studies

46 no response
7 used casually, low use, not used
1 looked in files myself

I & R

46 no response
7 low use
1 looked in files myself

9. What are your suggestions for improvement of the Neighborhood Resource Centers and their operation during the second project year?

21 more publicity, more community outreach, involve branch staff in publicity
20 no response, suggestions
10 other (simplify checkout procedures, organize better, broader range of materials, more specific neighborhood materials, more "quick use lists," have a few well developed centers rather than many small ones)

10. Feel free to add any comments or suggestions about the project that we have not covered.

41 no response
6 low use of materials, materials not being used at all
5 miscellaneous comments (e.g. staff very responsive to requests for informational resources; libraries should cater to the general public and avoid becoming advocates to any special groups; this material is probably available elsewhere, but perhaps in a disorderly, unmanageable fashion, etc.)
2 positive comments (e.g. a good resource, it will probably do well in time)

VIII. Project Staff Evaluation Questionnaire Results

For project evalution purposes and to benefit others interested in establishing a similar information system between libraries and community groups, both full time project staff members completed a project evaluation questionnaire (see appendix G for copy of the questionnaire.)

Project Librarian

The project librarian broke his responsibilities and additional activities undertaken into percentages of his time spent on each activity, see below:

24% select, obtain, organize, oversee processing for and distribution to the appropriate Neighborhood Resource Centers relevant materials.

10% review, select, assign subject headings, determine distribution, have photocopies made and distribute to full-scale NRC's newspaper articles significant to a particular neighborhood--and neighborhood improvement activities--found in local newspapers.

2% establish routines for handling NRC materials consistent with existing Seattle Public Library policies

2% coordinating activities in branches with liaison committee librarians

6% writing of monthly reports to supervisor, minutes of meetings with liaison librarians, writing of sections relating to SPL activities for the project's quarterly reports, other activities involving writing

5% contact with community groups to explain and publicize project

5% answering questions from branch staff about NRC project, about materials, etc.

5% answer reference questions from project users (the targeted population)

3% workshops for SPL staff

8% initial survey of branches to determine appropriate locations for centers and to discuss the project's goals individually with staff members. Actual installation of the centers.

2% explaining and publicizing the NRC Project among non-SPL library community

1% explaining and publicizing the NRC Project among city officials, the different city departments, etc.

3% one-time-only preparation of materials for initial establishment of NRCs (maps, shelf-files, etc.)

3% visiting centers for upkeep, inventory purposes

21% other administrative duties, travel times etc.

Of these activities he feels that the selection of appropriate materials to stock the centers was the most important and that the neighborhood oriented map, newspaper clipping files and the development of a unified system for posting important city notices at the libraries were other important activities. The other full time project staff member, the Community Information Specialist, feels that the most important activities of the Community Information Librarian were establishment and maintenance of the Neighborhood Resource Centers, selection of materials for the NRC collections, cataloguing materials, "training" library staff, project publicity and answering requests for information from the public.

The Community Information Librarian felt that of his project activities, establishment of small centers at five of the 22 branch libraries contributed least to the goal of the project. He feels that establishment of the small centers were really a waste of time and that attention should be focused only on the full scale NRC's rather than some full scale and some smaller NRC's. The Community Information Specialist felt that

maintainence of neighborhood newsclipping files took too much time for the amount of use the files received.

Both the project librarian and Community Information Specialist agreed that the project could have benefited from more publicity; attendance at more community group meetings to promote use of the NRC's, more radio and TV announcements and newspaper coverage.

Community Information Specialist

Breakdown of responsibilities and additional activities undertaken by the Community Information Specialist by percentage of time spent on each activity is as follows:

10% coordination of computerization of community group information

10% updating community group information into computer

5% sale of computerized directories/policies regarding directories

5% grant writing

15% case studies

5% development of Community Resource Center

15% information and referral services to general public

5% project publicity

5% CRC newsletter

5% project progress reports, evaluation

20% meetings with persons interested in the project, answering letters of inquiry about the project, staff meetings, advisory committee meetings, special computer requests.

Of these activities, the Community Information Specialist believes production and sale of the computerized directory is one of the most significant because it has proven to be in demand and creates a base for the CRC and NRC project and no one

else offers such a service. She also believes the newsletter is important, serving as publicity for the project and keeping community leaders up to date on project developments. She also feels provision of information and referral services to be extremely important as community leaders and staff of city departments and special interest groups have demonstrated a need for a central clearinghouse of current information on active community groups.

The project librarian agrees the provision of information and referral is a valuable service and that development and distribution of the directory is a major drawing card for the NRC's since it is a unique resource. He also believes that the case studies are important in that they may spur some groups in to documenting more of their own activities.

The Community Information Specialist feels that researching and writing case studies takes a great deal of valuable time away from other project activities, such as promoting use of the NRC's, when it may be much more efficient for the community groups to document their own activities. She feels the role of the Community Information Specialist should be to assist and perhaps edit case studies that commmunity groups write themselves and arrange for their inclusion in Neighborhood Resource Centers rather than actually write the case studies.

Advantages/Disadvantages of a Cooperative Sponsored Project

The Community Information Librarian felt it advantageous to establish the community information system in cooperation with the Community Resource Center because of the CRC's contacts and experience working with community groups in the area.

The Community Information Specialist believed that the advantage of working with the library on the establishment of the community information system was that project staff employed by the library were familiar with library processes and policies and were able to facilitate project activities much more easily than someone who was not a library employee.

Both the Community Information Librarian and Specialist agreed that the disadvantage of two organizations working cooperatively on the project was that activities became more complex and time consuming with two bureaucracies involved rather than one.

Problems Encountered During the First Project Year

Some problems encountered by project staff during the first project year were:

Delay in Opening of the Neighborhood/Resource Centers

Opening of the Neighborhood Resource Centers was slow due to slow reception of materials ordered for the collections.

Confusion Over Roles of Project Staff

There was some confusion over the exact responsibilities and lines of authority of project staff, compounded by the fact that two complex organizations were working cooperatively on a project. Lines of authority and responsibilities should have been more clearly delineated in the project proposal.

Lack of Clerical Support

Both the Community Information Librarian and Specialist felt the need for more project support in terms of clerical help.

The Project Librarian had the assistance of half time clerk

but he felt he could have used a full time assistant to help set up and stock the NRC's, put together the maps and process the materials. The Community Information Specialist also was assisted by a half time secretary, who later was recruited to help with production of the CRC newletter and updating of the community group information into the computer. The Institute of Public Service also sponsored a part time work-study student to help the Community Information Specialist contact community groups for updated information.

Staff Suggestions for Persons Establishing Similar Community Information Systems

Community Information Librarian:

> Select parts of the project which seem to be most appropriate or valuable to another library system from that system's perspective. These selected components should be prioritized--which is most important, which should be implemented first. Implement them one stage at a time using the existing staff. If sufficient staff time is available or if only a few parts of this project are selected for implementation, do all at the same time so that the resultant 'project' can be publicized more easily ('grand opening', etc.).

Community Information Specialist:

> Make sure that each staff member knows his/her role/ responsibilities and that all procedures are as simple as possible if two organizations are going to be working cooperatively. A good deal of project staff time should be spent publicizing the project and training library staff.

IX. Project Evaluation by Others Closely Associated with the Project

A questionnaire was given to other key personnel directly involved with the project including the Principle Investigator of the project at Seattle University, the Head of the Governmental Research Assistance Library (the operating base for the Library's portion of the project) and the Assistant City Librarian, Community Services (see appendix H for a copy of this questionnaire).

These persons felt that the advantage of a cooperative community information project between a University and library system is the complementary relationship between the University's contacts with the community and the dissemination system of the Library as well as the increased flexibility afforded the project operating out of the University. The disadvantage they saw was the increased complexity of the project involving two institutions and the extra communication time needed as a result of this complexity.

Following is a summary of their comments of specific project activities:

Neighborhood Resource Centers

--Slow in starting up, level of use disappointing thus far
--Centers are well designed and serve a useful purpose
--Zoning maps drew attention

Case Studies

--The one in circulation at the time of this writing is useful, disappointing the others were not completed sooner

CRC newsletter

--Useful, attractive, well done and serves purpose
--Could be expanded with more staff time

Computerized Directories of Community Information

--Positive user response
--Very valuable resource, especially when updates are readily available

CRC Information and Referral Services

--No comments

Project Publicity and Outreach

--More publicity and substantially more community outreach are needed

Suggestions

--A larger materials budget is needed and a cardfile rather than a book catalog
--Organizational relationships among staff need to be clarified
--Those planning such a project need to be less ambitious about what can be done in one year
--An important criterion for project staff selection is the ability to work interestingly and effectively with community leaders
--More branch staff involvement is needed in developing the content of the Neighborhood Resource Centers

Comments

--The Neighborhood Resource Centers designed for this project are satisfactory
--The project will be difficult to evaluate based on the need for project services and whether the design of the services meets the need.

X. Summary

As stated in the proposal for the "Information for Community Action" project, the goal of the project was to establish a system for providing community groups with information to aid them in their effectiveness; through cooperation between academic and non-academic community resource centers and public libraries. Part of that goal was that this system, if proven effective, could be duplicated by other libraries and community resource centers. Measurable objectives were to include a determination of: 1) whether or not the informational needs of the community groups were met after establishment of the system (number of requests by such groups for information, number of requests filled, circulation of materials in the community resource collections), 2) if this information contributed to the effectiveness of the community groups (as determined by questionnaire responses) and 3) the effect on the neighborhood libraries (demand for services as measured by circulation, informational services, and in library use; agency by agency, compared to prior years).

Expected results and benefits of the proposed project were: 1) the establishment of a central community resource collection and depository, 2) an ongoing means of assessing the changing informational needs of community groups, 3) branch library community resource collections and a means of updating these collections from the central collection. Updating of the information and ongoing assessment of community groups' needs were to be accomplished by: 1) computerization of the community group files, 2) the CRC newsletter, 3) case studies and 4) graduate students and faculty researchers.

Using the data collected by the five questionnaires, the telephone logs kept by both the Community Information Specialist and the Project Librarian, the circulation records and on-site visits by the Librarian, the sales records of the computer produced Neighborhood Group Directory, and requests for copies of the case studies and information and referral requests, an assessment can be made as to how close the project came to reaching the stated goal. Since the project is divisible into discrete components, each component or activity will be summarized separately in the following pages.

Community Information System

Neighborhood Resource Centers

Use of the centers is currently below the level of use of the regular branch book collections. Pre and post project questionnaires completed by leaders of community groups indicate establishment of the centers has not, at this time, changed the information gathering practices of the persons who responded. Unfortunately responses were not received from individuals connected with community groups located near five out of the eight full-scale Neighborhood Resource Centers. The ones who responded have not begun to view their neighborhood library as a resource to aid them in their neighborhood improvement activities. Evaluation questionnaires returned by branch library staff show that establishment of the centers has not made a significant impact on their role in the library. However, the short time these centers have been in operation at the time of the project evaluation, several months

for many of them, prevents drawing the conclusion that such centers will not prove to be an effective means for providing community groups with useful information in the future. Project staff feel fortunate to have been awarded funding for an additional year in order to give the NRC's a fair test of their utility as a community information system.

During the course of the second project year staff will act on suggestions for improvement of the NRC's from community leaders, branch library staff, advisory committee members and others closely associated with the project. Some changes/improvements to the NRC's proposed and under discussion at this time are:

1) Catalog as many of the NRC materials as appropriate so that they will be reflected in the branch card catalog. Both library staff and patrons normally turn first to the card catalog so this measure should increase the visibility of NRC materials.
2) Increase the NRC material loan period to three weeks, consistent with other library materials. This would simplify the system and make use of the materials more attractive to potential patrons and to library staff who circulate the materials.
3) Concentrate on the further development of the established full-scale Neighborhood Resource Centers in selected branch libraries with basically uniform collections rather than the current mix of full-scale and small-scale NRC's. Operation of NRC's of different sizes is confusing to an extent for the branch staff and the public. Most library patrons looking for the type of information located in the NRC's do not bother going first to a small-scale center. The small-scale centers (fourteen of them) were generally not worth the effort to

set up. Archboards should have been provided to the non-NRC branches so that a uniform method for posting notices would be instituted system-wide but beyond that, efforts should have been concentrated on the full-scale centers.

4) Devote more time to project publicity and community outreach and include branch library staff in these activities. Branch tours could be set up for community group members so they could become more familiar with a particular branch's NRC collection and other materials available from the regular branch collection relevant to their community council activities. This kind of direct interaction between line staff members and members of the group specifically targeted by the project would allow a greater level of involvement and the assuming of a more active role on the part of the branch staff members. Library staff also indicated a desire for more training.

5) If an interim assessment of use of the NRC's conducted two-thirds of the way into the second project year indicates continued under-utilization of some of the centers and there are demonstrably active community groups in the service area of those particular branches, integrating the NRC materials with the rest of the branch collection should be considered. The entire branch would be promoted as a "Neighborhood Resource Center". The small centers which were not being used could be considered for deactivating mid-way through the second year after consulting branch library staff members and local community group representatives.

Computerization of the Community Group Files

The large number of computerized community group directories sold by the CRC indicates such current information about community

groups and their activities is valuable to staff of city departments, special interest groups and community groups themselves. Due to the constantly changing concerns and activities of these community groups and the rapid turnover of their elected leaders, computerization of such information has proven to be the most feasible method of keeping such information current. Copies of the computerized community group directories in neighborhood libraries should prove to be a valuable resource for community leaders, but because they were not included in the collections until the end of the project year, data is not available on their use in the libraries at this time.

During the next year project staff will develop a subscription rate policy to enable printout and dissemination of updates to the directory for those desiring this service. They will also either need to make this activity self-sustaining or integrate it into another organization's activities.

Community Resource Center Newsletter

The numerous requests during the project year to be included on the CRC newsletter mailing list indicates the demand for and utility of a newsletter that informs community leaders of neighborhood activities locally and nationwide and of resources available to them which could contribute to their effectiveness in their activities. The large number of inquiries for project produced products mentioned in the newsletter and for detailed information about the project from persons across the nation indicates that the newsletter is a good tool for disseminating information about the project to persons across the country interested in similar activities.

As with the directory, project staff will need to set a subscription policy for the newsletter during the second project year to make it a self-sustaining activity or develop another means for its continuation after expiration of federal support.

Case Studies

The topics for the five case studies were chosen based partly on requests for information or assistance received by the CRC staff as well as the project Advisory Committee's suggestions. A demonstrated need was met with their publication. However, copies of four out of five of the case studies were not available until after the project evaluation was either underway or completed. The first one produced was well received. This activity was viewed as too time consuming by the Community Information Specialist taking into account the existing staff limitations. Perhaps it would be more efficient for the community leaders themselves to document their activities rather than an outside project staff member.

Utilization of Students and Faculty Researchers

Utilization of graduate students and faculty researchers for project related activities from the Institute of Public Service (IPS) was minimal due to the nature of the IPS program. Classes for this particular program are held in the evening and the majority of students are already employed during the day in professional roles, limiting their time for taking on extensive community planning projects/internships. (Although the Community Information Specialist received numerous inquiries about the possibility of paid employment opportunities with the project). Utilization of students as resources may be more feasible for an undergraduate

or day time academic program.

Advisory Committee

Attendance at the Project's Advisory Committee's meetings dropped over the course of the year. Perhaps smaller neighborhood based citizen advisory boards or committees concerned with a certain aspect of the project would have been more effective.

Institutional Staff Relationships

Occasionally during the project year misunderstandings developed concerning lines of authority of the staff members of both institutions - - Seattle Public Library and Seattle University. Internal staff problems in each institution also occurred. Because of the complexities of the two institutions working together, a detailed memorandum of understanding defining the roles and responsibilities of each institution would make possible a smoother functioning project.

Second Project Year

In addition to developing and promoting the use of the NRC's during the second project year and instituting some of the changes mentioned above, project staff will demonstrate four "models" of library and community group interaction. A brief description of the four models follows.

Model #1: Citizen/Local Expert/Library Interaction Model -
A series of workshops hosted by the CRC and Seattle Public Library to bring representatives of local government and neighborhood improvement groups together, with library staff, to discuss the most effective means of assessing the ongoing informational needs of community groups and making this information available in the Neighborhood Resource Centers.

Model #2: Community Contributions to Neighborhood Resource Collections -
Project staff will develop a system of utilizing information systematically collected by community groups through contributions of resource materials from neighborhood leaders to the "Neighborhood Resource Center" collections.

Model #3: Community Outreach Model -
Designated branch librarians will assume an active role and attend community council meetings, locate information of use to the particular community council (aided by the Project Librarian) and make this information available at the branch NRC.

Model #4: Computer Assisted Information Retrieval Model -
A computer terminal will be placed in a neighborhood library and workshops will be held with branch librarians and community group members on the use and capabilities of the computer for

serving community groups' informational needs. Relevant data bases of local information will be identified and developed for use.

Appendix A

GROUP # 35 EASTLAKE COMMUNITY COUNCIL
LOCATED WITHIN SEATTLE CITY LIMITS

EASTLAKE COMMUNITY COUNCIL
EASTLAKE COMMUNITY COUNCIL
PO BOX 4101
SEATTLE,WA.98104

OFFICER NAMES:

KATHYSHEA (PRES)
2012 MINOR E
SEATTLE,WA.98102
322-3189 (HOME)

DAVIDKOHLES (VPRES)
2008-C MINOR AVE E
SEATTLE,WA.98102
682-3140 (OFFICE)325-4351 (HOME)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

BOARD MEETING INFORMATION: BI-MONTHLY
AT KATHY SHEA'S HOUSE

COMMUNITY MEETING INFORMATION: MONTHLY
THIRD TUESDAY EACH MONTH AT SEWARD SCHOOL AT 7:30 PM

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

ISSUE KEYWORDS:
LAND-USE TRANSPORTATION

ISSUES:
REVIEWING SEVERAL CONDOMINIUM CONSTRUCTION PROPOSALS , TRAFFIC AND PARKINPROBLEMS

COALITIONS: CENTRAL SEA COMM COUNCIL FEDERATION

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

NEWSLETTER: HAND-DISTRIBUTED MONTHLY. CONTACT KAPPY TRIGG AT 322-2221.
BOUNDARIES:
SOUTH IS NEWTON STREET , WEST IS LAKE UNION , EAST IS THE FREEWAY , NORTHIS UNIVERSITY BRIDGE

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

ELECTION MONTH: MAY
BEGAN IN 1972 FOR: GREW OUT OF FLOATING HOMES ASSOC OVER ROANOKE REEF ISSUE
FUNDING:
COMMUNITYCOCKTAIL PARTY AT HORATIO'S FOR FUNDRAISER
UPDATED BY JB ON 06/21/79

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Appendix B
reduced

Vol. 2, No. 1
Aug-Sept, 79

COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER NEWSLETTER

Community Resource Center, Institute of Public Service
Seattle University, Seattle, WA 98122 (206) 626-6373

The Community Resource Center, an information/referral center for community groups, is a component of the Institute of Public Service, Seattle University. The Institute of Public Service offers a Master's Degree Program in Public Administration and a Human Resource Development Certificate Program.

NRC Collections

ADDITIONS TO "NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCE CENTER" COLLECTIONS - Several additions have been made to the collection of your "Neighborhood Resource Center" in your branch library. The Centers now have copies of two case studies of selected activities of local community groups.

"The Montlake Community and the R.H. Thomson Expressway", by Margaret (Peggy) Connon Johnson, is a detailed account of the Montlake community and their fight against the R.H. Thomson. The report is an inspiration for citizen activists and includes hints on community organizing strategies as well.

"Fundraising Strategies for Community Organizations to Support Major Activities" is a case study of the Southeast Effective Development's (S.E.E.D.) history and strategies of securing major grants to support its community planning and improvement activities. The report was written by Julie Burr as part of a federally funded project to establish a system of providing useful information to community groups.

A copy of the CRC's computerized directory of community councils/clubs has al been added to most "Neighborhood Resource Center" collections.

This community information project has been refunded for an additional year t demonstrate four models of library/community group interaction towards satisfying community groups informational needs. For more information about the project or t give suggestions/comments, contact project staff: Julie Burr (626-6373), or Don Willis (625-4868.)

NCAT Grants

NCAT GRANTS PROGRAM - YEAR 3 -- The National Center for Appropriate Technology (NCAT) is currently announcing its Grants Program, Year 3. NCAT is an independent non-profit corporation, funded by the U.S. Community Services Administration (CSA) to develop and apply appropriate technologies to specific needs of low-income persons, and to promote locally based programs that develop individual and community self-reliance.

The NCAT grants program provides limited funding for research, demonstration and utilization of appropriate technologies in low income communities. Currently $900,000 is available for grants nationwide. Community Action Agencies (CAAs), Community Development Corporations, non-profit corporations, public agencies, co-o and Indian tribes are eligible for NCAT grants. In its third year, NCAT has allocated funds for the following types of grants:

1) Solar Greenhouse Impetus Grants: small grants of $1,000 to stimulate interest in passive solar greenhouses as an important technology to assist low-incom communities.

2) Integrated Community Demonstration Grants: planning grants of approximat ly $150,000 for cities and small towns to demonstrate as many integrated appropria technologies by as many participating community groups as feasible.

3) Specific Technology Demonstration Grants: grants of approximately $10,00 each to demonstrate or test the feasibility of specific technologies in low-income communities including renewable energy, building technology, recycling, and agriculture.

4) Innovative Technical Grants: awarded to highly innovative technical proposals which respond to problems in appropriate technologies, advance the state-of the-art of appropriate technology and have a high impact on low-income persons.

NCAT has four funding cycles for its third year, continuing through May of 1980. For more information please write to: Grants Division, National Center for Appropriate Technology, P.O. Box 3838, Butte, Montana 59701; or call (406) 494-45

BOTTLE BILL I-61

BOTTLE BILL VICTORY IN MASSACHUSETTS SPURS I-61 -

Initiative 61, the Returnable Beverage Container Act, got a boost recently whe Massachusetts became the eighth state in the country to pass deposit legislation. The bill is almost identical to Initiative 61, which is on Washington's November 6t general election ballot. It will place a 5¢ minimum refundable deposit on all beer and softdrink containers.

Steve Zemke, co-chairman of I-61, points out that deposit legislation not only saves the consumer money at the shelves, but saves energy and raw materials, and reduces solid waste and litter as well. "Right now these companies are making millions of dollars off of us by selling throwaways: beverage containers which we buy, use once and then throw away, only to pay for new containers the next time we go to the store. With Initiative 61 we will borrow the containers, rather than buy them," Zemke said.

Initiative 61 sponsors need your financial support to help pay basic campaign expenses like office rent, telephones and mailings, as well as to run their own publicity campaign. Contributions are urgently needed. Volunteers are also needed to help with leafletting, doorbelling, voter registration and the like. To contribute or volunteer to help contact: Citizens for Returnable Beverage Containers, 1406 NE 50th, Seattle, WA 98105 / (206)525-9453.

Community Advisory Group Forming

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP ON ENERGY FORMING - King County is inviting nominations for a Community Task Force to assist in the development of an energy management plan for the county. The plan will recommend policies to guide energy-related decision making in King County for the next decade.

The Community Task Force will help identify and prioritize key energy management issues and policy options, formulate energy management goals and objectives, and identify, evaluate and prioritize program alternatives. Meeting times and locations will be determined by the Task Force, with time commitments expected to be in the range of a dozen meetings during the time period from October 1979 to October 1980.

If you would like more information about the King County Energy Planning Project, or the formulation of the Community Task Force, please contact Aleta Thompson, 344-4056.

GRASS ROOTS HANDBOOK

GRASS ROOTS HANDBOOK - A Manual for Citizen Activists - Accurate, simply-worded information on organizing a grass roots campaign, on government agencies, on looking up the law, the Handbook covers the initiative and referendum processes, state and local open meeting laws, freedom of information laws, national and state environmental acts, and more. There are five case studies of successful citizen campaigns in Seattle - for example, the Pike Place Market Initiative and Downzoning on Queen Anne. The cost of the Handbook is $3.00 for single copies and $2.50 each for five or more. Please call the Metrocenter YMCA at 447-4553 for more information. Or, copies of the Handbook can be borrowed from your "Neighborhood Resource Center."

ENERGY FORUM

ENERGY FORUM NORTHWEST, a part of the Office of Community and Organization Development in Continuing Education at the University of Washington, will sponsor a two day conference on "Energy and Neighborhoods." The conference will be in the HUB at the University of Washington in Seattle on September 29th and 30th.

The conference will feature small group workshops on the application, design and construction of small-scale appropriate technologies; national and local experts examining the current state of neighborhood energy technology in the Northwest; an exploration of practical solutions to common problems encountered in planning community technology projects; policy issues affecting community energy projects; and bus tours to local sites.

If you would be interested in displaying materials, please contact us. A detailed conference agenda will be available in early September. If you would like further information on the conference, contact Don Pendleton or Ellen Kampel at (206) 543-0980.

Community Resource Center
Institute of Public Service
Seattle University
Seattle, WA 98122
(206) 626-6373

NON PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SEATTLE WASH.

Appendix C

Community Information Project Advisory Committee

Dr. Brenda Dervin
127 Communications DS-40
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

Mr. Wallace Drayton
Cherry Hill Coalition
810 18th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98122
Tel: 329-2861

Ms. Donna Edwards
N.W. Region, Greenwood Branch
8016 Greenwood Avenue N.
Seattle, WA 98103

Ms. Kristi Farley
Citizen Participation Coordinator
Department of Community Development
400 Yesler
Seattle, WA 98104

Mr. Jeff Finn
Office of Neighborhood Planning
Department of Community Development
400 Yesler
Seattle, WA 98104

Mr. John Fox
Fremont Land Use
Fremont Multi-Service Center
3410 Fremont North
Seattle, WA 98103
Tel: 632-1285

Ms. Enid Griswold, Deputy Librarian
Public Services
King County Library System
300 Eighth North
Seattle, WA 98109

Mr. Phil Harrison
(Cascade Regional Library)
10702 Lakeside North East (home)
Seattle, WA 98125

Lucy Gorham
Metrocenter - YMCA
909 4th Ave. 98104

Mr. Scott Kirkpatrick
S.E.E.D.
4707 Rainier Avenue South
Seattle, WA 98118
Tel: 723-7333

Ms. Mary Lincicome
Mr. Baker Community Council
2334 Shoreland Drive South
Seattle, WA 98144

Ms. Arlis Stewart
People Power
YMCA
909 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98144
Tel: 447-3617

Ms. Char Schultz
McMicken Heights Improvement Club
P.O. Box 68005
Seattle, WA 98188

Mr. Gary Strong
Associate Director
Washington State Library
Olympia, WA 98504

Ms. Helen Sutton
West Seattle Community Council
4451 46th Avenue Southwest
Seattle, WA 98116

Ms. Barbara Wise
Green Lake Community Council
7741 First Northeast
Seattle, WA 98115

Dr. Douglas Zweizig
School of Librarianship
University of Washington
Suzallo Library
Seattle, WA 98195

INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Seattle University

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98122
TELEPHONE (206) 626-5760

Appendix D

Pre-Project Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups

August 14, 1978

Dear Community Leader:

This enclosed questionnaire is being sent to you as an individual active in your neighborhood. It is part of a one-year federally funded cooperative project jointly undertaken by Seattle Public Library and Seattle University's Community Resource Center (part of their Institute of Public Service.) It is the intent of this project to make needed information more easily available to individuals concerned with their neighborhoods. A separate 'neighborhood resource center' will be established in each neighborhood and station library in the Seattle Public Library system. The information contained in this collection will be aimed directly at the needs of people active in their communities.

Your answers to the questions will help us in selecting information which will be most useful to you and making it available in your nearby neighborhood library.

You will be kept informed of new material added to the collection and the general progress of the project in the monthly CRC Newsletter.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation in making this project a success.

Don Willis
Community Resources Librarian

Julie Burr
Community Information Specialist

This questionnaire has been tested and should only take you about 10 minutes to complete. Please use the stamped envelope to return your response to us by August 31st.

1) a) Are you a member of a neighborhood improvement group (e.g. community council or club)?

_____ yes _____ no

b) If yes, what is the name of the group to which you belong?

_____

If no, please pass this questionnaire on to someone you know who is a member of a neighborhood improvement group or feel free to fill it out if you are active in your community and have information you want to share.

2) What are the major issues your neighborhood improvement group was actively involved with during the past year?

3) What informational resources did you use to help you in your neighborhood activities? (Including agencies, written materials and resource persons)

4) What informational resources did you find most useful? Why?

5) How did you find out about these informational resources? (Indicate if you contacted an individual, agency, or read about them, etc. Please be as specific as possible).

6) What information was difficult to find or unavailable that you would have found useful in your neighborhood activities?

7) a) What is the name of your neighborhood library?

7) b) Which neighborhood library do you use most often?

7) c) How often do you use this library?

_____once or more/week _____3 - 4 times/year

_____2 times/month _____rarely

_____once/month _____never

7) d) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

_____ yes _____ no

7) e) If yes, what type of activites were you involved in and what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities?

7) f) If no, why haven't you used this library to obtain information to help you with your neighborhood activities?

8) a) Do you use the main Seattle Public Library located downtown?

_____yes _____no

8) b) If yes, how often do you use this library?

_____once or more/week _____3 - 4 times/year

_____2 times/month _____rarely

_____once/month

8) c) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

_____yes _____no

8) d) If yes, what type of activities were you involved in and what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities?

8) e) If no, why haven't you used this library to obtain information to help you with your neighborhood activities?

9) a) Do you use the Municipal Reference Library of the Seattle Public Library system?

_____ yes _____ no

9) b) If yes, how often do you use this library?

_____ once or more/week _____ 3 - 4 times/year

_____ 2 times/month _____ rarely

_____ once/month

9) c) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

_____ yes _____ no

9) d) If yes, what type of activities were you involved in and what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities?

9) e) If no, why haven't you used this library to obtain information to help you with your neighborhood activities?

10) What information related to neighborhood improvement would you like to see included in neighborhood resource centers in your neighborhood library, main library and Municipal Reference Library?

neighborhood library -

main library -

municipal reference library -

For a valid evaluation of our project it will be necessary to send out a follow up questionnaire in approximately 10 months. For this reason we would appreciate it if you would include your name, address, and phone number on the questionnaire. Your individual answers will be kept confidential.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Neighborhood where you live: _____

INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Seattle University

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98122
TELEPHONE (206) 626-5760

Appendix E

Follow-Up Project Evaluation Questionnaire Sent to Leaders of Community Groups

June 12, 1979

Dear Community Leader:

Enclosed is a follow up to a questionnaire you completed about 10 months ago. As you may recall, the purpose of that questionnaire was to help us determine your informational needs as a community leader and to help us select information to be included in a "Neighborhood Resource Center" in your branch library. The establishment of "Neighborhood Resource Centers" in Seattle's branch libraries was made possible through a grant award to the Community Resource Center at Seattle University and the Seattle Public Library. The attached brochure shows where these Neighborhood Resource Centers are located.

Project staff are currently in the process of evaluating the first year of the "Neighborhood Resource Center" project and would appreciate your help by responding to our questionnaire and returning it to us in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope. The Community Resource Center and the Seattle Public Library have received additional funds to expand and develop the project during a second project year so your response to this questionnaire will be used as a guide for our coming activities as well.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation.

Julie Burr
Julie Burr
Community Information Specialist
Community Resource Center

Don Willis
Don Willis
Community Information Librarian
Seattle Public Library

This questionnaire has been pretested and should only take you about ten minutes to complete. Please use the pre-addressed, stamped envelope to return your response to us by June 29th. Feel free to use the backs of pages or another piece of paper for more lengthy comments than allowed for in the spaces provided.

1.(a) What is the name of your neighborhood?

(b) What is the name of the neighborhood improvement group to which you belong?

2. What are the major issues your neighborhood improvement group was actively involved with during the past year?

3. What informational resources did you use to help you in your activities? (including agencies, written materials and resource persons)

4. What informational resources did you find most useful and why?

5. How did you find out about these informational resources? (Indicate if you contacted an individual, agency or read about them, etc. Please be as specific as possible.)

6. What information was difficult to access or unavailable that you would have found useful in your neighborhood activities?

7.(a) What is the name of your branch library?

(b) Do you use this library?

____yes ____no

If yes, how often?

____once or more/week ____3-4 times/ year

____2 times/month ____rarely

____once/month

(c) Do you use another branch library in addition to, or instead of, the one nearest your residence?

____yes ____no

If yes, why?

8.(a) Are you familiar with your Neighborhood Resource Center which is now a part of your branch library?

____ yes ____ no (if no, skip to 9(a))

(b) If yes, how did you hear about the Neighborhood Resource Center?

(c) Have you browsed through or actually used materials from the Neighborhood Resource Center collection?

____ yes ____ no (if no, skip to 9(a))

(d) What materials in the collection interested you and/or contributed to your effectiveness as a neighborhood improvement group leader? (explain)

(e) What materials were not included in the Neighborhood Resource Center collections that you would find useful as a neighborhood leader?

(f) Do you have any comments about the Neighborhood Resource Centers? (physical set-up, helpfulness of librarins or project staff, etc.?)

9.(a) Do you use the main Seattle Public Library located downtown?

____ yes ____ no

(b) If yes, how often do you use this library?

____once or more/week ____3-4 times/year

____two times/month ____rarely

____once/month

(c) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

____ yes ____ no

(d) If yes, what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities?

10.(a) Do you use the Governmental Research Assistance Library (formerly called the Municipal Reference Library) of the Seattle Public Library system?

____ yes ____ no

(b) If yes, how often do you use this library?

____once or more/week ____3-4 times/year

____two times/month ____rarely

____once/month

(c) Have you used this library to find information to help you with your neighborhood improvement activities?

____ yes ____ no

(d) If yes, what type of information did you obtain to help you with those activities?

For a valid evaluation of our project, we would like to compare your response to this questionnaire with your response to a similar questionnaire sent to you approximately 10 months ago. For this reason we would appreciate it if you would include your name, address and telephone number on the questionnaire. Your individual answers will be kept confidential.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Neighborhood where you live: _____

Appendix F
Project Evaluation Questionnaire Given to Branch Library Staff

Name _____

NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCE CENTER PROJECT EVALUATION

Project staff would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to andswer the following questions to help us evaluate the Neighborhood Resource Center project. Please return your completed questionnaire to the Project Librarian, Don Willis at the G.R.A. Library by June 22.

1. In which library or libraries do you generally work?

2. Do you think Resource Centers for Community Council/Club members belong in the library system or in some other agency? Please explain.

3. Has the establishment of Neighborhood Resource Centers in Seattle's branch libraries affected your role as a library staff member?

4. If so, how do you feel about this change?

5. Do you think library staff need special training to adequately serve the informational needs of Community Council/Club members? If so, what kind of training?

6. Has training given by project staff been helpful in answering questions about the Neighborhood Resource Centers during this past year? Explain.

7. What is your impression of the following aspects of the Neighborhood Resource Centers (NRC) in Seattle's branch libraries:

physical set-up

materials in the NRC collections

system for circulating NRC materials

use of the NRC's

NRC project staff

8. Are you aware of the following components of the NRC project being coordinated at the Community Resource Center (CRC), Seattle University:

Community Council/Club directory	_____yes	no _____
Community Council/Club map	_____yes	no _____
CRC Newsletter	_____yes	no _____
Case studies	_____yes	no _____
CRC I & R services	_____yes	no _____

Please describe how you know about or how you have used any of the above mentioned components of the NRC project:

Directory

Map

Newsletter

Case Studies

I & R

9. What are your suggestions for improvement of the Neighborhood Resource Centers and their operation during the second project year?

10. Feel free to add any comments or suggestions about the project that we have not covered.

Thank you.

Appendix G
Project Evaluation Questionnaire Given to Project Staff

"Information for Community Action: A Demonstration of University/ Public Library Cooperation in Meeting Community Groups' Informational Needs"

Name: _____

Title: _____

1) What are your major activities as Project Librarian/Community Information Specialist for the "Information for Community Action" Project?

2) What percentage of your time do you spend on each of these activities?

3) What other activities do you engage in as Project Librarian/ Community Information Specialist for the Project?

4) What percentage of your time does each of these activities take?

5) Of all your activities, which do you think contribute most to the success of the project and why?

6) Which activities do you feel contribute the least to the success of the project and why?

7) Which of your activities do you feel could be dropped altogether without detracting from the project?

8) Do you feel there are any activities that would have been worthwhile for you to undertake which you didn't, and if so, why weren't these activities undertaken?

9) What do you feel are the advantages and disadvantages of this project as a cooperative project between a University and a Public Library?

Advantages:

Disadvantages:

10) What do you feel are the most significant activities of the other full time project staff member, the Project Librarian/ Community Information Specialist? Why?

11) What do you feel are the least significant activities of the Project Librarian/Community Information Specialist? Why?

12) Describe your feelings of the helpfulness or lack of helpfulness of other project related staff?

13) Do you feel there was a need for additional project staff, and if so, for what type of support?

14) Do you feel the allocations in any of the budget categories of the grant were inadequate? Explain.

15) Do you feel you could have gotten by with less money allocated in any of the budget categories? Explain.

16) Describe any unexpected problems encountered during the project year?

17) Describe any unexpected positive experiences encountered during the project year?

18) What suggestions would you have for someone using this demonstration project as a model for their own project?

19) What progress do you feel was made during the project year toward reaching the project goal of establishing a system of providing information and assistance to community groups to aid them in their effectiveness in community planning and betterment activities. Explain.

20) Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Appendix H

Name _____

1. What is your role in the "Information for Community Action Project?

2. How much time do you spend on project related activities per week?

3. Do you feel your role and the amount of time you spend on project related activities are appropriate? Explain.

4. From your observations over the past year, what do you feel are the advantages and disadvantages of a cooperative project between a University and Public Library?

5. What are your feelings about the organizational set up of project staff?

6. What are your comments about the following significant project activities of the past year?

   Establishment of Neighborhood Resource Centers in Seattle's Branch libraries:

   Case Studies:

CRC Newsletter:

Computerized Directories, Labels, etc.:

CRC I & R Services:

Project Publicity and Outreach:

7. If you were to "do it over", what would you do differently? the same?

8. Additional comments:

Appendix I
Neighborhood Resource Center
Catalogue Page

THE NEIGHBORHOOD

	COPIES LOCATED AT THE N.R.C.'s AT THESE BRANCH LIBRARIES				
	Q.A.	G.L.	COL.	W.S.	M.R.
ABC's of L.I.D.'s: Local Improvement Districts and Your Neighborhood (Dept. of Community Development)	X	X	X	X	X
Basic Steps of Planning	X	X	X	X	X
CRC Map: Community Councils/ Clubs in Seattle	X	X	X	X	X
Citizens' Action Guide: Monitoring Community Development Block Grants	X	X	X	X	X
Community Corporations and Neighborhood Control	X	X	X	X	X
Community Council: Its Organization and Funcition (How To Series)	X	X	X	X	X
Community Development Block Grant Program (March 1978 - 3rd Annual Report)		X	X		
Community Development: The Workings of a Federal-Local Block Grant (March 1977)	X	X	X	X	X
Cooperative Community Development (A Blueprint for Our Future)	X	X	X	X	X
Creating Interagency Projects: School & Community Agencies	X	X	X		
An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Planning Hypothesis			X		
Facilitating Community Change: A Basic Guide	X			X	
Grass Roots Fundraising Book: How to Raise Money in Your Community	X	X	X		
Handbook of Special Events for Nonprofit Organizations	X				
How to Get Access to News Media: A Guide for Citizens in Pierce, King and Snohomish Counties	X	X	X	X	X
If You Want Air Time	X	X	X	X	X

(CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)